

LANDS IN SEVERALTY TO INDIANS.

MAY 28, 1880. — Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCALES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT:

[To accompany bill H. R. 5038.]

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5038) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allot lands in severalty to Indians, having carefully considered the same, respectfully report:

Three questions naturally arise in considering this bill:

1st. Whether it is competent for Congress to change the provision of Indian treaties, or the present law upon this subject, by such an act;

2d. Whether, admitting the necessity for such legislation, there is any other or better mode by which the objects of the bill can be accomplished; and

3d. Whether the proposed legislation is expedient and necessary to protect Indians in the possession of their lands and to aid them in their efforts to ameliorate their condition.

In regard to the first proposition, it has not been a disputed question since the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cherokee tobacco case (11 Wallace; p. 620) as to whether an act of Congress would repeal a former treaty, if they were repugnant to each other.

The Supreme Court, in this case, says that—

It is insisted that the section cannot apply to the Cherokee Nation, because it is in conflict with the treaty. Undoubtedly one or the other must yield. The repugnance is clear and they cannot stand together. * * * The effect of treaties and acts of Congress when in conflict is not settled by the Constitution. But the question is not involved in any doubt as to its proper solution. A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty.

It is clear that an act of Congress can alter the provisions of Indian treaties; and the second question naturally presents itself, as to whether said treaties can be changed or altered in any other way, and if additional legislation is needed, what body this duty devolves upon.

The act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat., p. 566), contains the following provision:

That hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty. * * *

Since the passage of this act no treaty has been concluded with Indian tribes, and all laws upon Indian matters not pertaining to the domestic affairs of the Indians have been by enactments of Congress. By the act above mentioned Congress has deprived the treaty-making power of all authority or responsibility in the premises, and assumed the

duty of legislating for the Indians whenever such legislation may be needed.

Acts abrogating, repealing, and amending the provisions of Indian treaties have been repeatedly enacted since the date of the act of 1871.

In some cases agreements were first made with the Indian tribes stipulating and providing for such changes, &c., which agreements, or the substance thereof, were embodied in the act, while in other cases the acts were passed without consulting the Indians, but they were not to take effect until the Indians assented to their provisions.

The ninth section of the bill under consideration provides—

That the provisions of this act shall not extend to any tribe of Indians until the consent of two-thirds of the male members twenty-one years of age shall be first had and obtained.

While this bill proposes to alter and change certain portions of Indian treaties, it cannot possibly violate any obligations assumed by the government towards the Indians, as its provisions are not to be applied to any Indian tribe until a majority of such tribe consent to the same.

As Congress has the sole authority to legislate upon the subject of this bill, the only remaining question to be considered is as to the expediency of such proposed legislation.

The Indians in the United States have been a race of hunters, and the larger proportion of them, until within the last twenty-five years, lived principally upon game and what was contributed to them by the United States. The system of holding lands in common was well adapted to the condition of the Indians, so long as they were isolated from the whites and followed no other pursuit for a living than that of hunting, but their reservations now are small, white men are encroaching upon them on all sides, and the game has almost entirely disappeared. The Indians have shown no capacity or inclination to engage in mercantile or any other pursuit, except that of agriculture, and if laws are not made to encourage and enable them to make their living in this way, they will soon be entirely dependent upon the government for their support.

Experience has shown that the system of community of lands creates idleness, inefficiency, and dependency, and this is especially true in regard to the Indians.

The progress made by the Indians who have received allotments of land in severalty clearly demonstrates the practicability of the provisions of the bill under consideration, and the advantages to be derived by the Indians from holding their lands in severalty.

Lands were often ceded to individual Indians east of the Mississippi River by the old treaties, but they were granted without proper restrictions on the power of alienation, and in some cases the Indians were compelled to sell their lands within a specified time. Those who were allowed to retain their reserves were forced to separate from their brethren and submit their person and property to the laws of the State where their lands were located. In brief, the effect of the provisions of these treaties was merely to give to the Indians the privilege of selecting a tract of land for the purpose of sale. No guarantees securing the possession were made, but, upon the contrary, it was the settled policy of the government to encourage and compel the Indians to surrender their lands and remove west.

In 1854 and 1855 treaties were made with a large number of Indian tribes providing for the allotment of their lands in severalty. As the experiment was tried more extensively in Kansas than in any other State under these treaties and later ones, it is necessary that an examination in brief should be made of the condition of these Indians while

holding their separate tracts, and at the same time comparing the allottees with those Indians in the same State or vicinity, and in some cases of the same tribe, who continued to hold their lands in common.

It should be first stated, however, that none of the treaties referred to contained sufficient restriction to prevent the Indians from alienating their reserves, and on this account their progress was retarded by white men who were endeavoring to obtain possession of their lands.

During the years intervening between 1855 and 1861 the following Indians in Kansas received allotments of land in severalty, viz: A portion of the Shawnees, the Miamies, the members of the confederated band of Peorias, Piankeshaws, Weas, and Kaskaskias, the Pottawatomies, the Chippewas and Munsees, a portion of the Wyandottes, and the New York Indians.

The Delawares received allotments in 1861 and 1865, and a portion of the Kickapoos and Ottawas in 1863.

The Osages and Kansas Indians held their lands in common until their removal, and a few Iowas and Sac and Foxes of Kansas, and a portion of the Pottawatomies and a portion of the Kickapoos, still hold their lands in common.

Commissioner Dole, in his annual report for 1864, p. 37, says that the—

Shawnees, who number about 860, have advanced well in civilization, a large portion of them owning and cultivating their lands in severalty, and but for the vicinity of the Missouri border, the farmers would have realized a fair return from their labor.

The Shawnee agent states, in his annual report for 1866 (Report of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, p. 259), that—

By reference to the statistical returns of farming, &c., accompanying this report, it will be seen that a much larger breadth of land has been cultivated than in any former year and with much more favorable result. While taking the census I visited every house and farm belonging to the members of the tribe, and I was often agreeably surprised to find well-cultivated fields where, from my knowledge of the owners and their former habits, I expected to find nothing. * * * On the farms of the most intelligent we find every variety of crops, together with apples, pears, peaches, and grapes, while the ignorant and uncivilized are content to live upon pounded corn raised mostly by the female portion of their families. *Of this latter class there are but few who hold their lands in severalty, while nearly all who hold their lands in common properly belong to this class.*

In report for 1867 the Shawnee agent says that—

The farming pursuits are carried on with considerable degree of prosperity by almost one-eighth of the tribe, *all of whom are severalty Indians.*

Most of these Indians were shortly after this removed to the Indian Territory, and have since made but little progress in civilization.

Agent Colton, in annual report for 1868, p. 267, states that the confederated Peorias, &c., decreased in the eighteen years from 1836 to 1854 1,166, or nearly five-sixths, while the decrease of the tribe from 1854 to 1868 was only one-third. The Miamies decreased in numbers from 1846 to 1854 five-sixths, and about one-half from 1854 to 1868. The agent says that "the decrease has not been as rapid and startling of late years is owing principally to the fact that they have lived more comfortably, have had warm homes, and drink less whisky." The statistics given in said report of the number and character of the houses and the quantity and value of the produce raised by said Indians show that they had been industrious and prosperous.

The agent for the Pottawatomies, in his annual report for 1862 (see Commissioner of Indian Affairs' Report for 1862, p. 118), speaks very flatteringly of the condition and prospects of said Indians. He says that they—

Are fully aroused to the practical utility of the dignity and productiveness of labor, and even the wild portions have cast off the absurd idea that appears to exist among the weak minded, * * * and have gone to work with a determination and will which surpass the most sanguine hopes of their warmest friends, and predict, with unerring certainty, that not many years hence we shall be able to reckon among the Pottawatomies the best farms and the wealthiest farmers in Kansas. * * * It [meaning the allotment of lands to the Indians] has in fact been the great stimulus to labor, and has aided very materially in bringing about the happy feeling that exists between themselves and the government. A large majority of the Pottawatomies appreciate fully the value of individual right in property.

Agent Palmer, in 1865 (office report for 1865, p. 376), states that—

A large proportion of that part of the tribe who have received lands in severalty are industriously engaged in opening farms upon their allotments. They seem to feel quite at home—say they have arrived at their journey's end, have unpacked and gone to work. It has been a frequent subject of remark that the Pottawatomies are laboring more this year, and manifesting more determination to accomplish something for themselves, than ever before.

Agent Hutchinson, in 1862 (office report for 1862, p. 109), says that the confederated Chippewa and Munsee Indians—

Have about the same amount of personal property as the Ottawas, and all live in houses and cultivate farms. There have been some indications of progress among these Indians during the past year, such as enlarging their farms and repairing and building houses.

The agent for the Kansas Indians, in speaking of the Chippewas and Munsees (office report for 1877, p. 118), states that—

These Indians have adopted the language and customs of the white race; they reside in comfortable dwellings, have finely cultivated farms and orchards, and by their industry and business capacity obtain all the necessities and many of the luxuries of life.

The allotments of the Wyandotts were subject to the jurisdiction of the state of Kansas, and they could be alienated by the reservee or his heir. The State authorities soon levied upon said lands for taxes, and the Indians were forced to sell to obtain money to satisfy the taxes, or allow the white men to purchase their homes at the tax sale, and on this account they received little advantage from the assignment of their land in severalty.

There were a few allotments made to the New York Indians, of Kansas, but many of them were occupied by whites before the selections were completed, and the Indians were driven by force from the other tracts in a short time. When the certificates of allotment were issued there were not a half-dozen Indians who had, or could obtain, possession of their lands.

The Delawares were removed a few years after the assignment of their lands in severalty. A large number of the men were soldiers in the late war, and while in the Army they contracted bad habits, which, upon their return to the tribe, had a deleterious effect upon those who were inclined to work, but their agents report that many of them built houses and opened farms on their allotments.

Agent Adams, in his annual report for 1867 (office report for 1867 p. 295), says that—

The farming operations of the Kickapoos have prospered during the past year. * * * That portion of the tribe who expect to remain in Kansas and become citizens of the United States are seemingly taking more interest in the schools than at first.

Agent Newlin says (office report for 1877, p. 119) that the Kickapoos have comparatively large fields and moderately good log houses, and that the allottees have developed more individually than those holding in common.

Agent Hutchinson, in speaking of the Ottawas, of Kansas (office report for 1855, p. 333), states that "many of them are doing well, open-

ing good farms, and accumulating property, but perhaps an equal number are not improving much." The agent, in 1867 (office report, p. 301), represents the number of Ottawas at 229, the number of houses owned and occupied 36, and the number of acres cultivated 650.

The condition of the Osage and Kansas Indians was very different from that of the Indians who received allotments.

Agent Snow says, in 1867 (office report, p. 324), that—

The Osages depend on the chase for a living. They have made but little advancement in civilization. They still dress in the "blanket" and use the bow and arrow for killing the buffalo, without whose flesh and tallow they cannot subsist.

In 1868 the agent represents them as being in a very destitute condition, and says (office report, p. 271) that "had it not been for the timely aid sent them by the government in February, many must have died from starvation." Agent Montgomery says of the Kansas Indians, in 1855 (office report, p. 114), that—

They are a poor, degraded, superstitious, thievish, indigent tribe of Indians; their tendency is downward, and, in my opinion, they must soon become extinct, and the sooner they arrive at this period the better it will be for the rest of mankind.

The efforts to establish and keep up a school among these Indians proved a failure (office reports for 1866, p. 274; 1867, p. 297; and 1869, p. 377).

There has been even greater progress among the Indians of Nebraska who received allotments than those of Kansas.

The agent for the Winnebagoes, in 1875 (office report, p. 324), reports the Indians "as progressing in industrial pursuits and advancing towards civilization and self-support," and appends statistics showing their relative progress over the two previous years.

The agent of the Santee Sioux says, in his annual report for 1879 (office report, p. 104), that—

They have come from the small hut to good frame and log houses, and from little patches of cultivated land to large wheat and corn fields, and from the dress of the wild Indian to the full garb of a citizen, leaving off the tomahawk and scalping-knife and making use of the plow and other farming implements, working the ground the same as the white man, and many of them are now prepared to be good citizens.

In the same report (p. 108), the agent for the Omahas says of those Indians that they—

Up to about six years ago, depended principally upon their annual buffalo hunts for subsistence. They then gave up the chase, and turned their attention to agriculture. In this short time they have made rapid progress, staying at home and taking great interest in improving their claims.

Agent Free says of the Sac and Fox Indians of Kansas and Nebraska (office report for 1878, p. 71) that "their lands being held in common, they cannot farm on a very large scale."

The agent for the Otoes and Missourias states, in regard to those Indians (office report for 1879, p. 103), that—

Their advancement in agricultural pursuits, for which the land they occupy is well adapted, is behind that of neighboring tribes, though their progress during the past year has been greater than any previous year. * * * They seem unwilling to give up the hope that they may yet return to the free and unrestricted life of their forefathers, and fear the development of farms and improvements will prevent the realization of that hope.

The Indians of Wisconsin and Minnesota who retained their allotments, or to whom land was assigned in severalty, with proper restrictions on the power of alienation, have prospered, and are becoming good farmers and industrious people.

The cases of the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws have

been sighted to show that greater progress has been made by the Indians who adhere to the tenure in common than those who took their lands in severalty. These tribes hold their lands by a different tenure than that of the common Indian title. Patents have been issued to the respective tribes in fee, subject to this condition only: That the lands are not to be conveyed, except to the United States; and in case the Indians become extinct or abandon the lands, the same are to revert to the government. By tribal laws the individual Indian is made the owner and secured in the possession of any tract of land which he may have improved or purchased, either directly or through mesne conveyances, from the party who had improved the land; and hence many of the benefits proposed to be granted by the bill under consideration were secured to the members of the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw tribes by these laws.

It is evident from the foregoing facts that the Indians must perish, depend solely upon the government for support, or make their living by farming; that the holding of lands in common retards their progress in agricultural pursuits; that the granting of land in severalty stimulates them to work, makes them self-reliant, and aids them in obtaining a practical knowledge of the laws of property; that Congress is the only body authorized to change the character of the Indian title, and that there is a great and imperative need of such legislation, the sole responsibility for which rests upon Congress.

Many of the Indians of the United States, especially those in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Oregon, and in Washington and Dakota Territories, are exceedingly anxious to have their lands assigned to them in severalty.

A. M. SCALES, *Chairman.*
JAS. R. WADDILL.
HENRY POEHLER.
D. C. HASKELL.
N. C. DEERING.
THAD. C. POUND.

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

Mr. Errett submitted the following as the views of the minority of the Committee on Indian Affairs:

The undersigned, members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, are unable to agree with the majority of the committee in reporting favorably upon this bill, for these, among other, reasons, viz:

I. The bill is confessedly in the nature of an experiment. It is formed solely upon a theory, and it has no practical basis to stand upon. For many years it has been the hobby of speculative philanthropists that the true plan to civilize the Indian was to assign him lands in severalty, and thereby make a farmer and self-sustaining citizen of him; and so far back as 1862 Congress established the policy that—

Whenever any Indian, being a member of any band or tribe with whom the government has or shall have entered into treaty stipulations, being desirous to adopt the habits of civilized life, has had a portion of the lands belonging to his tribe allotted to him in severalty, in pursuance of such treaty stipulations, the agent and superintendent of such tribe shall take such measures, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary to protect such Indian in the quiet enjoyment of the lands so allotted to him.

This law stands to-day on the statute book as the recognized policy of this government of the United States in its dealings with the Indians. It does not make allotments of lands in severalty obligatory, but recognizing the plea of those who contend for the beneficent effects sure to flow from the allotment policy, it has opened the door to its establishment, allowing any Indian, in any tribe, desiring to try that policy, a full opportunity to do so under the protection of the government. That law has been upon the statute book for nearly eighteen years, and how many Indians have availed themselves of its provisions? Manifestly, very few; and yet we are told, with great pertinacity, that the Indians are strongly in favor of that policy, and will adopt it if they get a chance. It is surpassing strange, if this be true, that so few have availed themselves of the privileges opened to them by the act of 1862.

Being an experiment merely, it would seem to be the dictate of wisdom to make the trial of putting it into practice on a small basis, say with any one tribe that offers a good opportunity for trying it fairly. The Chippewa bands on Lake Superior, for instance, are alleged to be willing to enter upon the experiment. They have good agricultural lands, are partially civilized and educated, and are sufficiently removed from barbarism to give ground for hope that the experiment may succeed. There could be no very strong reason against trying the experiment merely as an experiment with them. But this bill, without any previous satisfactory test of the policy, proposes to enact a merely speculative theory into a law, and to apply the law to all the Indians, except a few civilized tribes, and to bring them all under its operation without reference to their present condition. It includes the blanket Indians with those who wear the clothing of civilized life; the wild Apaches and Navajos with the nearly civilized Chippewas; and it applies the same rule to all without regard to the wide differences in their condition. It seeks to make a farmer out of the roving and predatory Ute by the same process as would be applied to the nearly civilized Omahas and Poncas. It needs no argument to prove that these Indian tribes vary widely from each other in their civilized attainments, but this bill ignores all these variances as if they did not exist, and erects a Procrustean bed, upon

which it would place every Indian, stretching out those who are too short, and cutting off the heads or feet of those who are too long.

It is true that the bill leaves a great deal as to the time of putting the bill in operation to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; but we submit that the interests of these tribes are of too great a magnitude to be left to the discretion of any one man, even though he be a Secretary of the Interior. We know of nothing in the constitution of that department that qualifies it peculiarly for such a great trust. Secretaries of the Interior change as frequently as the occurrence of a Mexican or South American revolution; and Congress, we think, is a safer depository for such trusts than any one man, no matter what place he may hold. Let us deal with these people intelligently and wisely, and not at haphazard.

We have said that this bill has no practical basis and is a mere legislative speculation; but it may be added that the experiment it proposes has been partially tried, and has always resulted in failure. In the hurry of drawing up reports we cannot be expected to be very specific in our citations, but we may cite the case of the Catawbas, who had lands assigned them in severalty, and who were protected by the inalienability of their homesteads for twenty-five years, just as this bill proposes; and the result was a failure—a flat, miserable failure. The Catawbas gradually withered away under the policy, until there is not one of them left to attest the fact that they ever existed, and their lands fell a prey to the whites who surrounded them and steadily encroached upon them. They were swallowed up as thoroughly as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, when the ground opened beneath their feet and engulfed them. (See Hist. Mag., 1st series, vol. 5, p. 46.)

II. The plan of this bill is not, in our judgment, the way to civilize the Indian. However much we may differ with the humanitarians who are riding this hobby, we are certain that they will agree with us in the proposition that it does not make a farmer out of an Indian to give him a quarter-section of land. There are hundreds of thousands of white men, rich with the experiences of centuries of Anglo-Saxon civilization, who cannot be transformed into cultivators of the land by any such gift. Their habits unfit them for it; and how much more do the habits of the Indian, begotten of hundreds of years of wild life, unfit him for entering at once and peremptorily upon a life for which he has no fitness? It requires inclination, knowledge of agriculture, and training in farming life to make a successful farmer out of even white men, many of whom have failed at the trial of it, even with an inclination for it. How, then, is it expected to transform all sorts of Indians, with no fitness or inclination for farming, into successful agriculturists? Surely an act of Congress, however potent in itself, with the addition of the discretion of a Secretary of the Interior, no matter how much of a *doctrinaire* he may be, are not sufficient to work such a miracle.

The whole training of an Indian from his birth, the whole history of the Indian race, and the entire array of Indian tradition, running back for at least four hundred years, all combine to predispose the Indian against this scheme for his improvement, devised by those who judge him exclusively from *their* standpoint instead of from *his*. From the time of the discovery of America, and for centuries probably before that, the North American Indian has been a communist. Not in the offensive sense of modern communism, but in the sense of holding property in common. The tribal system has kept bands and tribes together as families, each member of which was dependent on the other. The very idea of property in the soil was unknown to the Indian mind. In all

the Indian languages there is no word answering to the Latin *habeo*—I have or possess. They had words to denote holding, as “I have a hatchet;” but the idea of the separate possession of property by individuals is as foreign to the Indian mind as communism is to us.

This communistic idea has grown into their very being, and is an integral part of the Indian character. From our point of view this is all wrong; but it is folly to think of uprooting it, strengthened by the traditions of centuries, through the agency of a mere act of Congress, or by the establishment of a theoretical policy. The history of the world shows that it is no easy matter to change old methods of thought or force the adoption of new methods of action. The inborn conservatism of human nature tends always more strongly to the preservation of old ideas than to the establishment of new ones. The world progresses steadily, but always slowly. There are singularities in the Anglo-Saxon character and peculiarities in Anglo-Saxon belief which run back over a thousand years, and which all the enlightenment of progressive centuries has been unable to overcome. There are, even in our own land system, peculiarities which are the remnants of feudal forms and practices, and which still inhere in our methods simply from the force of habit and the conservatism of forms. And if this is true of ourselves, with a written history running back well-nigh two thousand years, why should we be so vain as to expect that the Indian can throw off in a moment, at the bidding of Congress or the Secretary of the Interior, the shackles which have bound his thoughts and action from time immemorial? In this, as in all other cases, it is the dictate of statesmanship to make haste slowly.

We are free to admit that the two civilizations, so different throughout, cannot well co-exist, or flourish together. One must, in time, give way to the other, and the weak must in the end be supplanted by the strong. But it cannot be violently wrenched out of place and cast aside. Nations cannot be made to change their habits and methods and modes of thought in a day. To bring the Indian to look at things from our standpoint is a work requiring time, patience, and the skill as well as the benign spirit of Christian statesmanship. Let us first demonstrate, on a small scale, the practicability of the plans we propose; and when we have done that, if we can do it, a persevering patience will be needed to make the policy general.

III. The theory that the Indian is a man and a citizen, able to take care of himself, possessed of the attributes of manhood in their broadest sense, and fully responsible to all the laws of our civilized life—a man like other men, and therefore to be treated exactly as other men—is embodied in the first part of this bill, which provides for giving every Indian a farm, and leaving him then to take care of himself, because, as is assumed by the framers of the bill, he *is* able to take care of himself; but having thus launched the Indian upon his future course of life, the bill turns round upon itself and, assuming that the Indian *is not* and *will not be* able to take care of himself, at once proceeds to hedge him around with provisions intended to prevent him from exercising any of the rights of a land-owner except that of working and living on his allotment. He cannot sell, mortgage, lease, or in any way alienate his land; and although he is to be under and amenable to the laws, he is to be free from taxation for all purposes. He is to be treated as a man in giving him land and exacting from him the duty of maintaining himself upon and off of it, and all this upon the plea that he is simply a man, who is to be treated as other men are; and then, as soon as we do this, we proceed to treat him as a child, an infant, a ward in chancery, who is unable to take care

of himself and therefore needs the protecting care of government. If he is able to take care of himself, all this precaution is unnecessary; if he is *not* able to take care of himself, all this effort to make him try to do it is illogical. If the Indian is a ward under the paternal care of government, he might as well hold his lands in common as in severalty. He cannot be made to feel the pride which a man feels in the ownership of property while he is made to feel that he does not possess one single attribute of separate ownership in the soil. In this respect the bill is like the old constitution of Virginia, which, when the convention which framed it put into it a clause providing a method for amending it, was said by John Randolph to bear upon its face the sardonic grin of death.

The main purpose of this bill is not to help the Indian, or solve the Indian problem, or provide a method for getting out of our Indian troubles, so much as it is to provide a method for getting at the valuable Indian lands and opening them up to white settlement. The main object of the bill is in the last sections of it, not in the first. The sting of this animal is in its tail. When the Indian has got his allotments, the rest of his land is to be put up to the highest bidder, and he is to be surrounded in his allotments with a wall of fire, a cordon of white settlements, which will gradually but surely hem him in, circumscribe him, and eventually crowd him out. True, the proceeds of the sale are to be invested for the Indians; but when the Indian is smothered out, as he will be under the operations of this bill, the investment will revert to the national Treasury, and the Indian, in the long run, will be none the better for it; for nothing can be surer than the eventual extermination of the Indian under the operation of this bill.

The real aim of this bill is to get at the Indian lands and open them up to settlement. The provisions for the apparent benefit of the Indian are but the pretext to get at his lands and occupy them. With that accomplished, we have securely paved the way for the extermination of the Indian races upon this part of the continent. If this were done in the name of Greed, it would be bad enough; but to do it in the name of Humanity, and under the cloak of an ardent desire to promote the Indian's welfare by making him like ourselves, whether he will or not, is infinitely worse. Of all the attempts to encroach upon the Indian, this attempt to manufacture him into a white man by act of Congress and the grace of the Secretary of the Interior is the baldest, the boldest, and the most unjustifiable.

Whatever civilization has been reached by the Indian tribes has been attained under the tribal system, and not under the system proposed by this bill. The Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles, all five of them barbarous tribes within the short limit of our own history as a people, have all been brought to a creditable state of advancement under the tribal system. The same may be said of the Sioux and Chippewas, and many smaller tribes. Gradually, under that system, they are working out their own deliverance, which will come in their own good time if we but leave them alone and perform our part of the many contracts we have made with them. But that we have never yet done, and it seems from this bill we will never yet do. We want their lands, and we are bound to have them. Let those take a part in despoiling them who will; for ourselves, we believe the entire policy of this bill to be wrong, ill-timed, and unstatesmanlike; and we put ourselves on record against it as about all that is now left us to do, except to vote against the bill on its final passage.

RUSSELL ERRETT.
CHAS. E. HOOKER.
T. M. GUNTER.